DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 988 TM 029 814

AUTHOR Flowers, Claudia P.; Hancock, Dawson R.; Joyner, Rowanne E.
TITLE Enhancing Students' Motivation To Learn by Matching Conceptual Level with Instructional Type.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Educational Technology; Group Membership; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Student Characteristics; *Student Motivation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Conceptual Level; *Direct Instruction

ABSTRACT

The main effects and interactions of a teacher's instructional methods (direct/nondirect) and students' conceptual levels (high/low) on the students' motivation to learn academic course content were studied with 65 college students in an introductory educational technology class. Students completed a measure designed to indicate their conceptual level and received direct or nondirect instruction according to T. Cicchelli's classification (1983). There was no statistically significant interaction between instructional strategy and conceptual level on students' motivation to learn course content. On the contrary, there was a statistically significant main effect for instructional groups in that students in the nondirect instruction treatment, regardless of conceptual level, demonstrated much higher motivation levels than student exposed to direct instruction. (Contains 2 tables and 10 references.) (SLD)

Enhancing Students' Motivation to Learn by Matching Conceptual Level with Instructional Type

Claudia P. Flowers

Dawson R. Hancock

Rowanne E. Joyner

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Paper presented at the 1999 AERA Annual Conference in Montreal.

Enhancing Students' Motivation to Learn by Matching
Conceptual Level with Instructional Type

Purpose

For years, educators at all levels have sought to maximize students' learning potential by offering instructional strategies which match the students' learning characteristics. One variable often found to influence the success of these matches has been students' motivation to learn. Although many studies have examined motivation as an independent variable (i.e., a relatively stable attribute within the learner), few studies have treated motivation as a dependent variable (i.e., something that may be influenced in order to enhance learning) (Hancock, 1994; Hunter, 1985; Pintrich & Schrauben, 1992; Wlodkowski, 1985). To fill this void in the research, the current study investigated the main effects and interactions of a teacher's instructional methods (direct/nondirect) and students' conceptual levels (high/low) on the students' motivation to learn academic course content.

In an attempt to replicate the findings of an earlier study (Hancock, 1994) in this area, the current study hypothesized significant increases in students' motivation to learn course content when a direct instruction treatment was experienced by low conceptual level learners and a nondirect instruction treatment was experienced by high conceptual level learners. Three specific hypotheses were examined:

Hypothesis 1. There are no significant differences between high and low conceptual level students regarding students' motivation to learn course content.

Hypothesis 2. There are no significant differences between teachers' direct and nondirect instructional patterns regarding students' motivation to learn course content.

Hypothesis 3. There are no significant interactions between conceptual levels and instructional patterns regarding students' motivation to learn course content.

Theoretical Framework

Kurt Lewin's early field theory research (Lewin, 1936, 1942) suggested that human behavior is often influenced by both the environment and an individual's characteristics. Subsequent research on aptitude-treatment interactions (Cronbach & Snow, 1977) revealed the positive impact of matching instructional strategies with learner characteristics.

In educational settings, one learner characteristic often found to interact with environmental conditions has been conceptual level (Hunt, Butler, Noy & Rosser, 1978). Conceptual level is an index on one's conceptual complexity (i.e., the ability to discriminate, differentiate, and integrate information) and interpersonal maturity (i.e., self-definition and self-other relations). Using the Paragraph Completion Method test (Hunt, et al., 1978), students may to classified as relatively high or low in conceptual level.

Furthermore, Cicchelli (1983) found that educational settings themselves may be classified by the extent to which the teacher influences the learning process. Specifically, teachers may be very directive (i.e., teacher-centered) or nondirective (i.e., student-centered). A direct instruction environment is one in which the teacher organizes learning tasks, establishes time and methods for instruction, and presents materials according to his or her objectives. A nondirect instruction environment is one in which students influence the organization of learning tasks and establish the time and nature of

instruction while the teacher encourages open exchange of ideas. Using the Instruction Pattern Observation Instrument (Cicchelli, 1983), instruction may be classified as direct or nondirect.

Research has found that motivation to learn course content may be influenced by proper matches between students' conceptual levels and teachers' instructional strategies (Hancock, 1994). One means of measuring motivation, Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory, views people as purposeful human beings who interact proactively in their environments based on their expectations that their efforts will result in outcomes they value. In the current study, a version of Vroom's (1964) model was used to measure high and low conceptual level students' motivation to learn course content after exposure to direct or nondirect teaching conditions.

Methods and Data Sources

Sixty-five students, enrolled in an introductory educational technology course entitled "Computer Applications in Education" at a large university in the southeast United States, participated in this study. The average age of the participants was 24.37 years with a standard deviation of 6.83. Eighty-two percent of the participants were female and 18 percent were male. The course was designed to teach students computer systems and software for enhancing teaching, learning, and educational management.

Four relatively equal-sized sections of the course were randomly assigned to one of two treatments (i.e., direct or nondirect instruction). Students in all four sections were given the Paragraph Completion Method test (Hunt, et al., 1978) and subsequently classified as high or low in conceptual level. Neither the students nor the instructor were aware of the conceptual level of the participants. In the direct instruction treatment, 16 students' conceptual level scores were above the median and 17 were below. In the nondirect instruction treatment, 19 students' conceptual level scores were above the median and 13 were below.

In five lessons, each 90 minutes over two weeks, the teacher administered the direct and nondirect instruction using scripts designed in accordance with Cicchelli's (1983) Instruction Pattern Observation Instrument. These scripts detailed the specific direct and nondirect behaviors associated with each treatment. The teacher was trained to adhere to the direct or nondirect instructional behaviors.

After the fifth lesson, a version of Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Theory model was used to measure students' motivation to learn course content. Means and standard deviations of motivation levels by conceptual level and instruction pattern were computed.

Results

A 2X2 ANOVA, in which the independent variables were students' conceptual levels (high/low) and the teacher's instructional strategies (direct/nondirect) and the dependent variable was students' motivation to learn course content in an introductory educational technology course, was conducted to analyze the data. Table 1 contains the means and standard deviations for the groups on motivation level. Table 2 contains the results of the factorial ANOVA with motivation as the dependent variable.

Insert Tables 1 & 2 about here

With respect to Hypothesis 1, there were no significant differences between high and low conceptual level students regarding students' motivation to learn course content. With respect to Hypothesis 3, there were no significant interactions between conceptual levels and instructional patterns regarding students' motivation to learn course content. However, with respect to Hypothesis 2, there was a statistically significant difference between the direct and nondirect instructional groups regarding students' motivation to learn course content.

Educational Significance of the Study

Unlike the earlier research (Hancock, 1994) upon which the current study was based, there was no statistically significant interaction between instructional strategy and conceptual level on students' motivation to learn course content. In other words, this study failed to discover significant increases in students' motivation to learn course content when direct instruction was experienced by low conceptual level learners and nondirect instruction was experienced by high conceptual level learners. On the contrary, the current study discovered a statistically significant main effect for instructional groups in that students in the nondirect instruction treatment, regardless of conceptual level, demonstrated much higher motivation levels that students exposed to direct instruction. These findings may stem from the nature of the content in the course and may offer new insights into the most suitable format for educational technology courses. Specifically, computer courses are traditionally taught in a very direct manner, often using prescriptive, self-paced manuals as the primary vehicle for instruction. The results of the current study suggest that direct instruction, often evidence in technology-based courses, may not maximize students' motivation to learn the course content. On the contrary, the current study suggests that all students, regardless of the manner in which they process information, would experience much higher levels of motivation to learn technology-based course material when exposed to nondirect instructional strategies. Future research could attempt to replicate these findings and explore other ways in which motivation to learn in computer courses may be optimized through the use of less prescriptive, nondirect instruction.

References

Cicchelli, T. (1983). Forms and functions of instructional patterns: Direct and nondirect. Instructional Science, 12, 343-353.

Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for research on interactions. New York: Irvington.

Hancock, D. R. (1994). Motivating adults to learn academic course content. The Journal of Educational Research, 88(2), 102-108.

Hunt, D. E., Butler, L. F., Noy, J. E., & Rosser, M. E. (1978). Assessing conceptual level by the paragraph completion method . Toronto: Ontario Institution for Studies in Education.

Hunter, M. (1985). Motivation theory for teachers: A programmed book. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.

Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K. (1942). Field theory of learning, Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Vol. 41,). Chicago: IL: University of Chicago Press.

Pintrich, P. R., & Schrauben, B. (Eds.). (1992). Students' motivational beliefs and their cognitive engagement in classroom academic tasks. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Wlodkowski, R. J. (1985). Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A guide to improving instruction and increasing learner achievement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Motivation Levels by Conceptual Level and Type of Instruction

Group/Subgroups	M	SD	n
Direct Instruction	12.19	11.13	33
Nondirect Instruction	21.03	13.82	32
Low conceptual level	16.31	13.52	30
High conceptual level	16.74	13.67	35
Direct Instruction			
Low conceptual level	14.06	13.16	17
High conceptual level	10.19	8.45	16
Nondirect Instruction			
Low conceptual level	19.24	13.53	13
High conceptual level	22.25	14.23	19

Table 2

2X2 ANOVA of Conceptual Level and Type Instruction on Motivation Level

	SS	df	MS	F	p
CL	3.02	1	3.02	.02	.90
Instruction	1270.94	1	1270.94	6.91	.01**
Interaction	188.66	1	188.66	1.03	.32
Residual	11221.55	61	183.96		

Multiple R = .317.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

TM029814

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: ENHANCING STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO LEARN BY MATCHING CONCEPTUAL LEVEL WITH INSTRUCTIONAL TYPE

Author(s): C.P. FLOWERS, D.R. HANCOCK, AND R.E. JOYNER

Corporate Source: UNC CHARLOTTE

Publication Date: APRIL 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Claudia Flowers

Printed Name/Position/Title: CLAUDIA FLOWERS / ASST. PROFESSOR

Organization/Address: UNC CHARLOTTE

Telephone: 704-547-4545 FAX: 704-547-3493

E-Mail Address: CPFLOWER@EMAIL.UNCC.EDU Date: 8/20/99

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
1129 SHRIVER LAB, CAMPUS DRIVE
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com